OFFICIAL

RECEIVED

80 South Eighth Street Minnespolis, Minnesota 55402-2215 USA TEL 612.332.5300 FAX 612.332.9081 www.merchant-gould.com

3200 IDS Center

JAN 2 6 2004

A Professional Corporation

Fax Transmission

January 26, 2004

TO:

Commissioner for Patents

Attn: Examiner Gary B. Nickol

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

FROM:

Mark T. Skoog

OUR REF:

8004.4USC1

TELEPHONE: 6

612.371.5240

Total pages, including cover letter: 4

PTO FAX NUMBER 1-703.872.9306

If you do NOT receive all of the pages, please telephone us at 612.371.5240, or fax us at 612.332.9081.

Title of Document Transmitted:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION

REQUIREMENT AND PETITION FOR

**EXTENSION OF TIME** 

Applicant:

**GOKCEN** 

Serial No.:

10/055,063

Filed:

**JANUARY 22, 2002** 

Group Art Unit: 1642

Our Ref. No.:

8004.4USC1

10. Boerboon

Confirmation No. 6838

Please charge Deposit Account No. 13-2725 in the amount of \$210.00 for 2-month extension of time fee for a small entity. Please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725. Please consider this a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME for a sufficient number of months to enter these pagers, if appropriate.

Name: Mark T. Skoog

Reg. No.: 40,178

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

January 26, 2004

GEN033\_DOT

Date 26, 2004

S/N 10/055,063

**PATENT** 

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

GOKCEN

Examiner:

G. NICKOL

Serial No.:

10/055,063

Group Art Unit:

1642

Filed:

**JANUARY 22, 2002** 

Docket No.:

8004.4USC1

Confirmation No.:

6838

Customer No.:

23552

Title:

METHOD AND COMPOSITION FOR TREATING PROSTATE

CANCER

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR L6(d):

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trudemark Office on January 26.

2004.

Name: Shery A. Boerboom

## RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper is being submitted in response to the Restriction Requirement mailed November 17, 2003.

Without acquiescing to the statements made therein, Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, the claims of Group I (claims 33-57) for prosecution in the instant application. The traversal is on the grounds that sufficient reasons and/or examples to justify a Restriction Requirement have not been provided. Accordingly, it is requested that the Restriction Requirement be withdrawn and that all the claims be examined. Therefore, all of the claims can be readily and properly examined together and need not be restricted into two groups.

Further, the Examiner has divided Group I into several species. Applicants respectfully traverse the species election requirement. Searching the species together would present no undue burden on the Examiner.

The Examiner has required Applicant to select among species of enzyme if Group I is chosen. In the event that the Examiner maintains the species election requirement, Applicants elect protease as a species of enzyme. Applicants submit that searching several enzymes in a

method such as that claimed generally presents no undue burden on the Examiner. The several enzymes share a common utility.

Applicants note that the species election has no effect if a generic claim is found allowable.

Examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, P.C. P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903 (612) 332-5300

Dated Van 26, 2004

By:

Mark T. Skoog Reg. No. 40,178

MTS:sab

23552